

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Summary

Prior to entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 18 were pending with Claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13 and 16 being independent claims and the remaining claims being dependent claims. Claims 12, 15 and 18 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13 and 16 have been amended without adding new matter. Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13 and 16 are pending with Claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13 and 16 being independent claims and the remaining claims being dependent claims. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13 and 16 in view of the amendments above and the remarks below.

Traversal of Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In lieu of the present amendment, Applicant has cancelled Claims 12, 15, and 18 without prejudice and disclaimer and reserves the right to present them at a later time. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 12, 15, and 18 are now moot and are not discussed further herein.

Applicants respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomsen (US 6,745,333) in view of Ala-Laurila et al. (US 6,704,789; hereinafter Ala-Laurila).

In regard to Independent Claim 1, the Office Action has not provided a prior art reference or references that teach or suggest all of the features recited in the pending claims.

Independent Claim 1 is directed to a method for limiting the use of an internet protocol address and includes: “determining whether the media access control address of the device which sends the signal can be identified from the acquired internet protocol address, according to whether the acquired internet protocol address corresponds to the generated second internet protocol address”. (emphasis added)

Reviewing Thomsen, it describes a “way to detect unauthorized access to a network by ascertaining the presence of spoofing activity.” (Column 5, Lines 15-18). More specifically, the presence of spoofing activity is ascertained by methods including “monitoring for data packets purporting to be from itself,” “searching for changing MAC addresses”, “tracking IP addresses”, and “scanning for non-local IP addresses” (Column 5; Lines 25-65 to Column 6; Lines 6-17). Nothing in Thomsen is seen to disclose or describe determining whether a media access control address of a device which sends a signal can be identified from an acquired internet protocol address, according to whether the acquired internet protocol address corresponds to a generated second internet protocol address, as recited in Claim 1.

Reviewing Ala-Laurila, it describes a method where a user utilizes a single mechanism to obtain an IP address in a data network and authenticating in the network to provide connectivity to the data network (Column 3; Line 65 to

Column 4; Line 2). More specifically, to authenticate, a user identification stored in a second network provides connectivity between a user and a first network obtained from a smart card in a user terminal (Column 4; Lines 2-6) .Nothing in Ala-Laurila is seen to disclose or describe determining whether a media access control address of a device which sends a signal can be identified from an acquired internet protocol address, according to whether the acquired internet protocol address corresponds to a generated second internet protocol address, as recited in Claim 1.

Because Thomsen and Ala-Laurila lack at least the above-noted features of Claim 1, Thomsen and Ala-Laurila alone, or in any combination, fail to disclose each and every feature recited in Claim 1, and the Office Action has failed to establish an adequate evidentiary basis to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C § 103(a). Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Independent Claims 4, 7, 10, 13 and 16 are directed to an apparatus and computer-readable storage medium for limiting data transfer and /or limiting the use of an internet protocol address and were rejected for essentially the same reasons as Claim 1. As such, the arguments set forth above with respect to Claim 1 are applicable to Claims 4, 7, 10, 13 and 16. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 4, 7, 10, 13 and 16 at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

The remaining claims (Claims 3, 6 and 9) are dependent claims and depend from one of allowable claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13 or 16. Therefore, the

dependent claims are also believed allowable because they depend from an allowable base claim. Furthermore, each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, and individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims pending in the application meet the requirements for patentability and respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of such claims at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct or credit any underpayments or overpayments submitted in conjunction with this response from/to deposit account number **502456**.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner may contact the
Applicant's undersigned representative at (949) 932-3329.

Respectfully submitted,

12/15/2008

/Jason Truong/

Date

Jason Truong, Reg. No. 53,704
Attorney for Applicant

Canon U.S.A. Inc., Intellectual Property Division
15975 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA 92618-3731
Fax: (949) 932-3560